

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Fan, Ziyun, Grey, Chris and Kärreman, Dan (2021) Confidential Gossip and Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, 42 (10). pp. 1651-1664. ISSN 0170-8406

Published by: SAGE

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620954016>
<<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620954016>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/44063/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



Confidential Gossip and Organization Studies

Journal:	<i>Organization Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	OS-19-0614.R3
Manuscript Type:	X and Organization Studies
Keywords:	Gossip, Secrecy, Confidential Gossip, Communicative constitution of organizations (CCO) < Theoretical Perspectives, Methodology, Ethics < Theoretical Perspectives
Abstract:	This essay sets out the case for regarding confidential gossip as a significant concept in the study of organizations. It develops the more general concept of gossip by combining it with concepts of organizational secrecy in order to propose confidential gossip as a distinctive communicative practice. As a communicative practice, it is to be understood as playing a particular role within the communicative constitution of organizations. That particularity arises from the special nature of any communication regarded as secret, which includes the fact

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	that such communication is liable to be regarded as containing the 'real truth' or 'insider knowledge'. Thus it may be regarded as more than 'just gossip' and also as more significant than formal communication. This role is explored, as well as the methodological and ethical challenges of studying confidential gossip empirically.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Confidential Gossip and Organization Studies

Authors

Ziyun Fan

Northumbria University

Christopher Grey

Royal Holloway, University of London

Dan Kärreman

Copenhagen Business School, UK and Royal Holloway, University of London

Corresponding Author

Ziyun Fan

- Newcastle Business School, Faculty of Business and Law, City Campus East 1, Northumbria University, Newcastle, NE1 8ST, United Kingdom.
- Email: ziyun.fan@northumbria.ac.uk

Confidential Gossip and Organization Studies

A: *Can we talk?*

B: *Yes, what is it?*

A: *The position that was recently announced at your place, is it earmarked for somebody?*

B: *Yes, kind of, it is a promotion case, I think. Not 100% sure, but that's what I hear.*

A: *Ok, thanks. Can I ask you a favour?*

B: *Sure.*

A: *Please keep it to yourself that I asked, I don't want people at my department to know that I'm looking elsewhere.*

B: *No problem. In fact, I shouldn't really have told you what I heard, so that's just between us, OK?*

A: *Of course.*

Introduction

In everyday organizational life people informally tell, are told, or ask for all kinds of information. As is the case in the stylized piece of conversation above, sometimes and probably often, they ask or are asked not to share it. So it's confidential. But the information shared is not very definite, is not official, and is based on hearsay. So it's gossip. How can we understand such commonplace interactions and why do they matter for studying organizations? This essay makes the case that the concept of *confidential gossip* enables us to understand these interactions. It also makes the case that they have an importance because of their particular role in talking organization and organizing into reality.

1
2
3 The particularity of that role arises because, confidential gossip is, itself, a particular kind of
4 gossip. By no means all gossip is confidential (e.g. gossip about celebrities), whilst by no means
5 all that is confidential takes the form of gossip (e.g. medical records). When it is confidential,
6
7
8 it can have more power than gossip in general because, as we will develop, confidentiality is a
9
10 form of secrecy, and secrecy carries a special charge, for example in being assumed to be ‘the
11
12
13
14
15 real insider’s’ knowledge.
16

17
18
19 Gossip in general is an activity that is surprisingly common. Gossip is estimated to account for
20
21 two thirds of all conversational time (Dunbar, et al., 1997; Emler, 1994) and is a major engine
22
23 for social networks – indeed it is even claimed to be “at the core of human social relationships”
24
25 (Waddington, 2016, p.811; see also Grosser, et al., 2010). From this perspective, gossip is far
26
27 more than just being something that circulates within the confines of the organization. Rather,
28
29 it is a fundamental part of what Gabriel (1995) calls the unmanaged organization: a kind of
30
31 organizational hinterland where affects, dreams, fantasies, myths, and stories reside and
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
animate organizing and the organization.

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180

1
2
3 Overall, the essay makes two main contributions. First, it extends existing scholarship on
4 organizational gossip by showing how secret or confidential gossip is a distinctive sub-category
5 of gossip that has particular implications for the communicative constitution of organizations.
6
7
8
9
10 Second, it provides a methodological platform upon which future empirical studies of
11 confidential gossip may be conducted.
12
13
14
15
16

17 We begin the analysis by discussing gossip as a concept in organization studies. We then
18 combine that with a discussion of secrecy in organization studies in order to generate the
19 concept of confidential gossip. Having done so, we develop the argument that confidential
20 gossip is important for organizations and their study because of its particular role within the
21 communicative constitution of organizations. Finally, we discuss the practical and ethical
22 difficulties entailed in the empirical study of confidential gossip in organizations.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **What is Gossip?**

34
35 Gossip is one of the most basic but perhaps one of the most misunderstood forms of
36 communication. At its core, gossip involves a minimum of two people, engaged in conversation
37 about things that in epistemological terms exists in the space between ‘known knowns’ and
38 ‘known unknowns’ – a conversation solidly based on hard facts would not usually be
39 considered as gossip, nor would a conversation about pure fantasy.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Within this space, what ‘counts’ as gossip is not simply about the content, but more importantly
50 the context in which it occurs. As Hannerz (1967, p.36) points out, “the communication that
51 Mrs A’s child is illegitimate is not gossip if it is occurring between two social workers acting
52 in that capacity, whilst it is gossip if Mrs A’s neighbours talk about it”. It is the relational
53 dimensions of gossip (Bergmann, 1993, p.48) that enable us to determine whether it is gossip
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or not. Contexts of gossip are, thus, themselves products of accumulated communication,
4 memories and relations, sedimented into patterns of interpretations and presuppositions that we
5 employ to understand social realities (see Stewart & Strathern, 2004).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Gossip has long been understood as part of informal communication (Paine, 1967, p.293, see
13 also Bok, 1982). Organizationally it is linked to the “informal communication network” (Noon
14 & Delbridge, 1993, p.23) and more generally to the “informal structures of organizations”
15 (1993, p.24). Importantly, Mills (2010) points out that gossip is nevertheless embedded in,
16 affects, and is affected by, formal organizational processes. This does not mean that gossip
17 itself is not an informal practice (‘formal gossip’ would be an oxymoron) but that, as
18 organization theorists have long known, formal and informal organization are not discrete
19 domains (see for example Diefenbach & Sillince, 2011). This is significant for our argument
20 here because it means that (confidential) gossip may have a role in the constitution of formal
21 as well as informal organization.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Because gossip involves at a minimum two people, it is a social process that can be understood
39 at interpersonal, group, and organizational levels and, importantly, as operating at the
40 conjunction of and across these levels (Michelson, et al., 2010). That matters, here, because it
41 relates to the capacity of gossip to play a role in the communicative constitution of
42 organizations. Much of the literature on gossip emphasizes social comparison (e.g. Suls, 1997;
43 Wert & Salovey, 2004) as one aspect of the wider issue of how gossip helps organizational
44 members make sense of ‘how things are done around here’ (e.g. Baumeister, et al., 2004;
45 Grosser, et al., 2010), and to understand appropriate ways of behaving within a particular social
46 setting (e.g. Wert & Salovey, 2004). Several studies have also shown another aspect of such
47 constitution where gossip acts as a vehicle to transmit group norms, values, and moral
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 principles (e.g. Paine, 1967; van Iterson, et al., 2011). In particular, gossip can mark out a
4
5 group's social boundaries (e.g. Hannerz, 1967; Rosnow & Foster, 2005), constructing the
6
7 awareness that "... 'we' do not gossip with any 'they' but among ourselves only" (Paine, 1967,
8
9 p.282). In this sense, gossip is intimately linked with the socialization and construction of
10
11 groups (which might be groups within organizations, or the organization as a group in its own
12
13 right), and mark those who are insiders from those who are outsiders.
14
15

16
17
18
19 Whilst these studies are concerned with what might broadly be thought of as the 'integrative'
20
21 possibilities of gossip (i.e. its role in bringing people together), other studies have shown its
22
23 potentials as a manipulative tool (Rosnow, 1977, p.159). The former shows how gossip can
24
25 play a role within organizational politics and power-play (e.g. Feldman, 1988), including as a
26
27 way of exposing or resisting power and inequality (e.g. Meyer Spacks, 1985). The latter relates
28
29 to how gossip can shape others' impression of oneself (e.g. Suls, 1977) or to construct and/or
30
31 reconstruct the image of a third party (e.g. van Iterson, et al., 2011). Finally, it should not be
32
33 forgotten that gossip in organizations can also provide pleasure and entertainment, generating
34
35 excitement, enjoyment or relaxation (e.g. Foster, 2004; van Iterson, et al., 2011). It may also
36
37 create displeasure, anger, or a sense of exclusion for those who are the target of, or are not
38
39 privy to, gossip.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In this sense gossip, as a form of communication, is not merely passed on within an
48
49 organization or organizational realities, rather, it contributes to the processes of how organizing
50
51 and organization are 'coming into being' through communicative practices (e.g. Ashcraft, et
52
53 al., 2009). Such constitution is distinctively formed through the paradox of particular gossip
54
55 where confidentiality plays a significant role at its organization: it is not meant to be shared
56
57 (e.g. 'among ourselves only') and yet leakage is inevitable. This reflects the fundamental
58
59
60

1
2
3 question of CCO as to how language and communication are part of the creation of the social
4 world: the ontogenesis of organization and organizing as such (Schoeneborn, et al., 2019).
5
6 Among other things, CCO research empirically look at how different devices – such as tropes,
7
8 lists, figures, models and other – in different modes – persuading, informing, bullshitting,
9
10 gossiping – are used in actual conversations and unfold their constitutive and formative role in
11
12 organizing collectives (Schoeneborn, et al., 2019).
13
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 Schoeneborn et al. (2019) suggest that this is performed in three specific ways: communication
21
22 as constitutive of (a) *organization* as a social entity or actor, (b) *organizing* as a social practice
23
24 or process, and (c) *organizationality* as an attribute or degree. The first way engages with the
25
26 tension between communication as a process and organization as an entity. Organization is
27
28 understood as an emergent and ever-fluctuating network of interlocking communication
29
30 processes, rather than merely a container of communication. The second way takes an interest
31
32 in the intersection between communication as a process and organizing as flows of practice,
33
34 focusing on how for example initiatives, rituals and policies are continuously talked and written
35
36 into being, edited and erased. The third way attempts to move beyond standard forms of
37
38 organization and organizing, widening the gamut into networks, markets, social movements,
39
40 communities, and so on. It is animated by the question of what makes these phenomena more
41
42 or less ‘organizational’ (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015; see also Blagoev, et al., 2019). Gossip
43
44 may be involved in all of these processes, but, as we will argue later, may play a particular role
45
46 for organizationality.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Introducing confidential gossip**

55
56 Our fundamental definition of confidential gossip is that it is that activity where gossip and
57
58 secrecy overlap. This means it has some characteristics that are not present for all kinds of
59
60

1
2
3 gossip (as well as lacking the characteristics of some kinds of secrecy, e.g. it has no legal
4 enforcement). Regarding the former, we will argue that this characteristic renders it especially
5 potent because secrecy has significant effects in terms of bestowing a sense of belonging to an
6 in group, and also in generating a sense that the information being shared has a particular
7 veracity. Gossip is, manifestly, a form of communication. Confidential gossip, for all that it
8 entails secrecy, is also a form of communication, undertaken according to particular rules
9 concerning who may and may not be communicated with, and about what.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Recent scholarship in organization studies has identified secrecy as an important aspect of
22 organizational life (Costas & Grey, 2014, 2016; Parker, 2016; Scott, 2015) and yet an
23 underdeveloped area of analytical investigation (e.g. Anand & Rosen, 2008; Jones, 2008). The
24 philosopher of secrecy Sissela Bok points to the etymology of secrecy and secrets as deriving
25 from *secretum* and ultimately *secernere* meaning to separate or keep apart, and for this reason
26 regards concealment as the defining trait of secrecy. Yet Bellman (1984, p.10) stresses a
27 paradox surrounding practices of secrecy as its essential contradiction that “the informant who
28 is telling a secret either directly or tacitly makes the claim that the information he or she speaks
29 is not to be spoken”. In this sense, secrecy is embedded with the inextricable dialectics between
30 the withdrawal and the communication of knowledge (Horn, 2011). It is both known and
31 unknown, both silent and communicable, to different groups and identities of people.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 This dual character points to the way that the formation and maintenance of secrecy entails the
50 construction and reconstruction of social relations and behaviour. In this way, as Costas and
51 Grey (2016) argue, secrecy makes and shapes organizations by creating ‘compartments’ within
52 which there is shared knowledge and around which there are boundaries, so that there are
53 insiders and outsiders of secrecy according to who is in possession of secrets and who is

1
2
3 excluded from them. In doing so, secrecy constitutes organization by constructing a ‘hidden
4 architecture of organizations’ (Costas & Grey, 2016; see also Parker, 2016).
5
6
7
8
9

10 Unlike formal secrecy, enforced by laws and official organizational rules, informal secrecy is
11 unofficially operated and maintained by social rules and norms (Costas & Grey, 2016).
12 Informal secrecy has audience and contexts with “logics of making and unmaking particular to
13 these contexts” (Hardon & Posel, 2012, p.S3). The ‘logics’ are constituted by and constitute
14 the complex rendering of social relations such as membership, allowing different ways of
15 selecting, presenting, interpreting, and identifying ‘us’ and ‘them’. Therefore, informal secrecy
16 is able to form, maintain, and/or split cliques and networks between and within the units of an
17 organization that may cut across the formal organizational structure (Parker, 2000).
18 Participating in informal secrecy can offer opportunities and tensions to explore networking
19 and social capital in organizations by being part of the ‘right network’, which can provide an
20 individual with first-hand information about upcoming projects and career opportunities.
21 However, when informal secrecy brings social differentiation, it simultaneously requires the
22 differentiation to be maintained, despite the “seductive temptation [of breaking] through
23 barriers by gossip or confession” (Simmel, 1950, p.466). Hence, when informal secrecy is
24 created to serve certain purposes and to protect vulnerabilities, it is itself vulnerable to betrayal.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 While studies of workplace gossip have indicated its ‘non-triviality’ in organizational
48 processes, they do not have a specific focus upon, although they do sometimes touch on, gossip
49 as a form of secrecy (e.g. Kurland & Pelled, 2000, p.432; Michelson, et al., 2010, p.380).
50 Confidential gossip can be regarded as having all of the various characteristics of gossip
51 identified in the literature discussed above, but with the additional feature of being shared as a
52 form of informal secrecy. Costas and Grey (2016, p.93-97) suggest that this entails the use of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 particular verbal and non-verbal cues which highlight the confidentiality of a particular
4 exchange of gossip. Phrases such as ‘you must keep this to yourself’, ‘this is just between us’
5 or ‘within these four walls’ are all common examples of such cues. Non-verbal cues might
6 include facial gestures or the lowering of the voice. Confidential gossip might be exchanged
7 with a particular injunction about who it can and cannot be shared with (e.g. ‘don’t tell X’) but
8 more generally participants may be assumed to know with whom it is appropriate or
9 inappropriate to share the gossip (Costas & Grey, 2016, p.97).

10
11
12 The distinction between gossip and confidential gossip is sometimes a hazy one, but it is
13 meaningful. It is true that many studies link gossip to discussion of absent third parties, which
14 might denote some degree of confidentiality (i.e. with respect to that third party). But even that
15 is not necessarily the case: it is quite possible conceptually, and no doubt common empirically,
16 for X and Y to gossip about Z (‘have you heard that Z is getting married?’) and for Y to then
17 discuss this with Z (‘I hear you are getting married’). Gossip becomes confidential when it
18 involves marked boundaries surrounding the shared knowledge and the processes of guarding
19 the boundaries (‘don’t tell Z, but s/he is going to get the sack’). Equally, gossip about third
20 parties might be confidential not with respect to the third party but to a fourth party (‘have you
21 heard, Z is getting promoted but don’t tell A, because s/he will be envious’).

22
23
24 It is therefore most certainly not the case that gossip always carries a connotation of secrecy or
25 confidentiality. For it is easy to identify some cases of gossip which are not confidential at all
26 (e.g. workmates gossiping about celebrities) and other cases where there is a strong expectation
27 that the information will be rigorously guarded (e.g. gossip about deeply personal or criminal
28 matters). But between these extremes there may well be a lack of clarity about exactly who can
29 and cannot be included in gossip. Very often gossip is passed on in the full knowledge that it

1
2
3 will be spread further. Even gossip accompanied with the injunction ‘don’t tell anyone’ might
4
5 within context contain a tacit understanding that this means ‘you can tell X but don’t tell Y’.
6
7 This means that gossip may become “secret” depending on who is being spoken to (Michelson,
8
9 et al., 2010, p.380), and so the line between confidential gossip and gossip is both context-
10
11 dependent and mutable. It is, nevertheless, a line the strength of which will be indicated by the
12
13 wording of way the gossip is communicated and the extent of its overtness.
14
15
16
17

18
19 The use of verbal markers to denote confidentiality does not in itself tell us why this is being
20
21 done (i.e. what it is about the information being shared that makes it sensitive), only that, for
22
23 whatever reason, it is. Horn (2011, p.108-109) identifies the three “logics of secrecy” of which
24
25 the first is, indeed, that of *secretum*, or locking away, the second is *arcanum*, also meaning
26
27 locking away but connoting the hiding of something special, and the third is *mysterium*, an
28
29 almost supernatural sense of what is hidden such that has the capacity to “elicit awe”
30
31 (Luhmann, 1989, p.138).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Thus making gossip secret *itself* communicates something over and above whatever
39
40 information may be shared: the very fact of it being secret (*secretum*) communicates that this
41
42 is some ‘special’ sort of information (*arcanum*), perhaps even something ‘magical’
43
44 (*mysterium*). By extension, it may suggest to those who are (and who are not) included in the
45
46 secret that they are (or are not) special sorts of people. The consequence of this is that although
47
48 confidential gossip has all of the characteristics of gossip with the addition of secrecy, it does
49
50 not follow that those characteristics are unchanged as a result of secrecy being added. In other
51
52 words, confidential gossip is not *just* ‘gossip plus confidentiality’. It becomes qualitatively
53
54 different from gossip in general. Put another way, confidentiality meaningfully changes the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 character of the content of the gossip. The cloaking of secrecy makes it more meaningful,
4
5 intense, important or otherwise consequential.
6
7
8
9

10 Simmel's (1906/1950) central insight that secrecy powerfully shapes social relations by
11 creating insiders and outsiders who share (or are excluded from) very strong bonds is crucial
12 here (see also Costas & Grey, 2014, 2016; Dalton, 1959; Schein, 1985). Secrecy has a mystique
13 about it, generating a sense of exclusiveness amongst those who share secrets but also a
14 temptation to hint at knowledge of secrets in order to boost a sense of importance. When there
15 is the 'thrill' of secrecy, the pleasure of gossiping can be intensified. Conversely, when secrets
16 are revealed, the sense of anger, loss or betrayal can be significant.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In relation to confidential gossip this means that the various things that gossip 'does' in
29 organizations are likely to be inflected differently and perhaps heightened when confidentiality
30 is added to the mix. For example, gossip about 'the way things are done around here' might be
31 taken especially seriously if it is shared with an imprecation to confidentiality because the
32 mystique of secrecy means that it is more likely to be regarded as more real and true as "the
33 'truth' behind the 'truth'" (Stewart & Strathern, 2004, p.38): If the things being kept concealed
34 were not important or special, why would they be confidential? In this way, even though
35 confidential gossip may be perceived as more invasive or destructive than gossip, people might
36 accept or perhaps even encourage it as it can be a form of 'triangulation' of what is open
37 knowledge, exploring what is going on 'behind the scenes' and supplementing certain
38 understanding of organizational life. For example, a new joiner to an organization might be
39 told one thing in a formal induction session but then told, in confidence, that the reality is rather
40 different, and would be likely to take this as the 'real truth'.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While confidential gossip constructs a strong and ‘aristocratic’ sense of ‘us’ as insiders, the
4 formation of groups is built alongside the possibilities of their ‘de-formation’ or collapse. The
5 emotional pleasure of belonging also carries with it a vulnerability. For the individual, that
6 includes the possibility of themselves being the subject of confidential gossip amongst others,
7 or the things that they have confided being repeated without their knowledge or agreement. In
8 this sense, confidential gossip circles, similar to other secretive groups, are “emotionally tightly
9 knit...[partially as] the direct result of the cost of betrayal” (Luhmann, 1989, p.160)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 With its emotional connectivity and tensions, confidential gossip enables gossip producers
22 along with other participants to manage communication topics and trajectories and to influence
23 (individual and) group identification. Such management might be achieved through forming
24 ‘strategic ambiguity’ (Eisenberg, 1984) that facilitates indirectness and avoidance of
25 communication (e.g. Hallett, et al., 2009) and leaves room for ongoing adjustment of evaluation
26 that shapes communication trajectories. In this way, evaluation could – at first – be constructed
27 implicitly (Hallett, et al., 2009), for as Bergmann (1992, p.154) “the delicate character of an
28 event is constituted by the very act of talking about it cautiously”. In the process of developing
29 and shaping directions of evaluations (e.g. praise or criticism of particular behaviour),
30 confidential gossip generates ‘organizing properties’ (Christensen, et al., 2017) that stimulate
31 participants’ ongoing discussions and learning about what ‘appropriateness’ means *to them*.
32 Because of the mystique of secrecy, knowledge imparted as secrets about what ‘we’ are and
33 what ‘they’ are is more likely to be taken as *the* reality and therefore to have an especially
34 strong impact upon group (and individual) identity recognition. By talking a specific sense of
35 ‘appropriateness’ into existence, confidential gossiping regulates group behaviour, which in
36 turn reinforces a sense of characterization and identification for being ‘us’ and not like ‘them’.
37 This process might also create identification tensions for some participants whose situated
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 understanding of ‘appropriateness’ are competing with the shared understanding (Winkler, et
4 al., 2020), leading to the weakening or even the breaking of social bonds. In this sense,
5 confidential gossip can be a source of (generating and expressing) dissent and simultaneously
6 a way of its management.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 This means that information which is particularly controversial, or resistant to power structures,
15 or sensitive in some other way, can be shared amongst participants whilst being kept from
16 others. In this sense, we might expect confidential gossip to be especially prevalent in particular
17 organizational contexts where open communication is for some reason difficult or discouraged.
18 Examples might include organizations which have a culture of bullying, or where there are
19 high levels of conflict and politicization. This is both because confidential gossip can protect
20 participants from bullying and conflict, and also because it can be a vehicle for these things to
21 occur (e.g. Crothers, et al., 2009; Feldman, 1988).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 From the perspective developed here, confidential gossip with its situational embeddedness in
36 local settings concerns ongoing social processes in which secrecy is initiated, sustained, and
37 enforced through social interaction, and in turn shapes social interaction. When we gossip about
38 others who are known to us, we are interacting with the structural feature of social relations
39 that presuppose a measure of ignorance and reciprocal secrecy. Thus, confidential gossip is a
40 genre of informal communication which selectively circulates intentionally and informally
41 concealed knowledge within a particular social network. It is shared among selected members
42 of the network who are both privy and relevant to the circulated knowledge and have shared
43 interests. At the heart of confidential gossip lie social relations that are the cause and
44 consequence of confidential gossip. At the centre of its constitution of organizationality lies its
45 processes and influence as a metaphorical crayon that draws and redraws a map of socialization
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and social relations at work, being powerfully persuasive that it communicates the ‘inside
4 truth’.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Schoeneborn et al. (2019) make the point that CCO implies a ‘low threshold’ view of what an
11 organization, or organizing, may be. From a CCO point of view the organizationality, as
12 Schoeneborn et al. (2019) label it, of collectives can emerge in almost any fashion, whenever
13 collective action is called upon (see also Taylor & Van Every, 2000). Importantly, this means
14 that the ‘organizationality’ of a social phenomenon is not a yes/no question but rather a matter
15 of degree (Blagoev, et al., 2019; Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In this sense, confidential gossip has particular potential to cast light on the emergence of
27 organizationality. Confidential gossip in organizations is not only a means of knowledge
28 exchange with semantic understanding, but also a way to render organizational members’
29 social recognition, perception, and awareness of organizational life. The collaborative
30 production of confidential gossip through its participants shapes individual construction
31 processes of social realities at work, influences desires and motivations of individuals and
32 groups, and affects power structures in both preferred and unintentional ways that in turn
33 ‘breeds’ the confidential gossip predominantly. Confidential gossip is in this way a ploy for
34 insiders to achieve individual- and/or group-interests. Processes of constructing, maintaining
35 and breaching confidential gossip may not be identical across organizations, and hence are
36 engaged by and embedded within a certain specialness and uniqueness of an organization.
37 Thus, by partaking in confidential gossip, participants reinforce their recognition of
38 organizational existence.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **How can we study confidential gossip?**
59
60

1
2
3 So far, we have put forward the idea of confidential gossip as a purely theoretical concept.
4
5 Ultimately, it would require empirical exploration, to which there are formidable
6
7 methodological barriers. Research on confidential gossip is by definition methodologically
8
9 challenging, given its character as a subset of both informal secrecy and gossip and therefore
10
11 its social ephemerality, contextuality, sensitivity, and embeddedness. Confidential gossip,
12
13 similarly to gossip, is an ephemeral activity that is difficult to ‘catch in the act’ of being
14
15 perpetrated (van Iterson, et al., 2011). It emerges, submerges, and reemerges in between social
16
17 connections and tensions, between interpersonal attachments and detachments.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Given the methodological challenges of confidential gossip and the similarities between
25
26 general and confidential gossip, we draw in the first instance on the empirical studies on gossip
27
28 as a reference point to consider how to study confidential gossip. Empirical studies on gossip
29
30 are primarily ethnographic focused and mainly conducted in the domains of anthropology,
31
32 sociology and psychology with some attention paid by gender and socio-linguistic studies.
33
34 Gossip has also been explored through several other approaches across disciplinary domains,
35
36 including archive studies (e.g. Besnier, 1989), diary studies that utilizes a structured diary
37
38 record with 7-point scale questions and open questions (Waddington, 2005), experimental
39
40 research (e.g. Cole & Scrivener, 2013), online research that focuses on conversations on
41
42 electronic bulletin boards (Harrington & Bielby, 1995), questionnaire studies (e.g. Baumeister
43
44 et al., 2004; Grosser et al., 2010), and interview studies (e.g. Hafen, 2004; Mills, 2010).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The ephemeral, contextual, sensitive, and embedded characters of confidential gossip
52
53 distinguish it from other ways of speaking. It may primarily be accessed through exploring
54
55 meanings and social interaction. Qualitative methods are particularly appropriate as they can
56
57 be used to capture the narratives and actors’ interpretations of situations and people (Filstead,
58
59
60

1
2
3 1970). This points to ethnographic methods as a possible way to access confidential gossip for,
4
5 as Edgar Schein notes in relation to his work on secrecy and in-groups, “you had to be a real
6
7 insider to know” (Schein, 1985, p.100). It is a topic eminently suited to what Anselm Strauss
8
9 apocryphally referred to as ‘hanging around and listening in’ by residing at the heart of social
10
11 life in an organization. It brings the particularities and ‘irrationalities’ of off-the-stage life
12
13 (Goffman, 1959) to the fore by giving a view of the variability of forms of organizing, the
14
15 multiplicity of social relations that constitute such various forms, the diverse connectivity that
16
17 ties the social relations in particular ways, the rules that are developed to maintain the
18
19 connectivity, and the sanctions that are introduced to prevent the maintenance from being
20
21 hindered.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Ethnographic studies on gossip have been predominately conducted by anthropologists.
29
30 Researchers often work as participant observers such as staying residents (e.g. Colson, 1953;
31
32 Hannerz, 1967; Haviland, 1977) and team members in an organization (e.g. Kniffin & Wilson,
33
34 2005). The importance of participant observation is noted by Hannerz (1967, p.45) as that
35
36 “probably there is no other way of acquiring knowledge about gossip”, which can make the
37
38 disconnected connected, make sense of the nonsense, make the obscure clear, make the silly
39
40 funny (Roy, 1959). Somewhat in contrast, Colson (1953) acts as both participant observer and
41
42 non-participant observer for particular age groups of informants. Studies also utilize two types
43
44 of invisibility when researchers are non-participant observers and are absent during the
45
46 occurrence of (certain) empirical evidence, including the use of electronic devices to record
47
48 participants in a particular setting (e.g. Thornborrow & Morris, 2004 videotaped a TV show),
49
50 and participants recording/taping their own social interaction (e.g. Guendouzi, 2001).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Linking these studies on gossip to confidential gossip, the methodological character of
4 participant observation enables researchers to conduct a ‘curious kind’ of empirical work on
5 confidential gossip through forming an ‘inbetweener position’ with both closeness and distance
6 in the field. Being a relative outsider could help to capture wider socialization contexts and
7 processes in which confidential gossip might be embedded. Being a relative insider could
8 enable researchers to be a member of the social system being studied and to interpret and
9 ‘translate’ the subtleties of meanings and implications surround confidential gossip. Hence the
10 ‘inbetweener position’ hopefully is close enough to the quotidian experiences and yet distant
11 enough to not turn such experiences into the taken-for-granted parts of organizational life. In
12 such scenarios, which might not be a ‘fly on the wall’ method, researchers are neither complete
13 participant nor complete observer. And, of course, fieldwork practices are contextually and
14 biographically varied (Van Maanen, 2011), so how we engage in and with the field is largely
15 shaped by what we want to know. Therefore the specific design of fieldwork on confidential
16 gossip will be shaped by particular purposes and focuses as well as situated access
17 negotiation(s).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 Each of the possible methods requires the confirmation of ethical approval from relevant
41 institution(s) and of research consent from its participants prior to the conduct of research.
42 Among the discussed methods, ethics for ethnographic methods on confidential gossip might
43 be the most complicated. The social embeddedness and contextuality of confidential gossip
44 indicate that if it is to be found, it would be interwoven in the wider socialization. Therefore
45 observational studies on confidential gossip might involve a broader focus on a wider range of
46 interaction than confidential gossip itself. Moreover, given the undesirability of being
47 identified as (confidential) gossipers (e.g. Bergmann, 1993), making confidential gossip a
48 direct and explicit focus to the observed might make it difficult, if not impossible, for
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 researchers to be actually included in confidential gossip. This points to the particular ethical
4 complexities that attend the research on confidential gossip which, in its nature, might be
5 sensitive and which was to some degree being covertly studied.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Roulet et al. (2017) emphasize that ethical consideration of any (degrees of) covert study should
13 be context dependent, as “it is in the particular cases of the here and now with participants that
14 ethics are situationally accomplished” (Calvey, 2008, p.908). Thus ethical considerations of
15 research conduct on confidential gossip should draw on a ‘situated ethics perspective’ (Roulet,
16 et al., 2017; see also Calvey, 2008) that pays more attention to ethics “as an ongoing social
17 practice” (Roulet et al., 2017, p.16) and “contingent, dynamic, temporal, occasioned and
18 situated affairs” (Calvey, 2008, p.912). The characteristics of confidential gossip as a genre of
19 informal, evaluative and sensitive communication require researchers to conduct the research
20 within ethical boundaries without triggering the dangers of hidden agendas, especially
21 regarding the issues of privacy invasion to both the researched and the researchers, and
22 sufficient protection of participants’ identities both during and after fieldwork.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Despite all of these challenges, we should not give up on the attempt to study confidential
41 gossip empirically. Going back to the stylised example of an interaction with which we began
42 this essay, readers might consider how often they, themselves, take part in interactions of this
43 sort. Our own experience is that they are commonplace and, to that extent, there is a face
44 validity in the claim that they are an important part of organizational life which we, as
45 researchers, should seek to understand. If that poses difficulties then we need to find ways to
46 overcome them rather than shy away from studying this aspect of organizations.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Conclusion**

59
60

1
2
3 In this essay we have brought forward the concept of confidential gossip to denote the practices
4 where gossip and secrecy overlap. As a form of gossip, it is a special form of communication;
5
6 as secrecy, it is a special form of gossip. One might therefore envisage confidential gossip as a
7
8 subset of gossip and gossip as a subset of communication.
9
10
11
12
13

14 Drawing on CCO that has identified the key role of communication in the constitution of
15 organization, we argue that confidential gossip plays a role within that. What we have urged is
16
17 that not only is that so, but its role is an important and distinctive one. What at first sight may
18
19 seem quite trivial is decidedly nontrivial. Consider even the very simple hypothetical example
20
21 with which we began, and imagine how it might play out.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In the hypothetical example, perhaps A does not apply for the job because of what B has said,
29
30 taking it especially seriously because B has said they shouldn't be saying it, and so A is
31
32 persuaded that it is most likely true. That has a direct effect on who ends up doing the role, a
33
34 small contribution to the making of organization. Perhaps, because A doesn't feel able to check
35
36 B's information is true as it was given in confidence, it turns out to be false and A is cheated
37
38 of the chance of the job. Perhaps, because both have committed to keep each other's confidence
39
40 they go on to share further confidences, with spiralling effects each time. Perhaps one or both
41
42 of them break the confidence, leading to A being marginalized in their department, or B being
43
44 told off by their boss, or both; and one or both, angered by the betrayal of confidence, embarks
45
46 on a feud which may have all kinds of repercussions for the organization.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 These and many other imaginable developments of that basic scenario are all organizationally
54
55 impactful and potentially organizationally important, and are all primarily attributable to the
56
57 particular way in which information was communicated, namely with the promise of
58
59
60

1
2
3 confidentiality. If, as students of organizations, we take seriously the idea that organizations
4 are communicatively constructed then we simply could not understand those developments if
5 we did not both know about the interaction and understand its specific quality as an instance
6 of confidential gossip, with all the charge that secrecy brings to it. And, not just as students of
7 organizations but as members of them, imagine if you were A or B, and your confidence had
8 been betrayed. How would you feel? That will perhaps disclose the emotional texture of what
9 is at stake, but that, again, only exists because it is about something that you thought was
10 confidential, and was not just 'routine' gossip.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 So we need the concept. But we also need to know about the interaction, so we have to have a
25 way, or ways, of accessing it empirically. Hence we have also explored how studying
26 confidential gossip is a complex matter, posing particular empirical challenges and ethical
27 concerns. The methodological difficulty is to capture the ephemeral phenomenon and elusive
28 practice of confidential gossip, and to encapsulate its fluid development and circulation in a
29 given social context, whilst not violating the rights of research participants. We have suggested
30 that ethnography or participant observation is the most feasible method as it 'gets inside' these
31 interactions, whereas methods relying on retrospective accounts (e.g. interviews) or diary-
32 keeping may fail, precisely because of the ephemeral nature of the phenomenon. Yet participant
33 observation involves the greater ethical challenge, since it entails reporting on things said in
34 confidence. One aspect of confidential gossip, and therefore a possible method of studying it,
35 which we have not touched on to is how it may occur not in face-to-face conversation but be
36 technologically mediated (e.g. WhatsApp groups) and this could be the focus of future work.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 In pointing to its often ephemeral nature, and despite pointing to the ethical issues in studying
57 it, we should nevertheless stress that confidential gossip is not necessarily or even often about
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Blagoev, B., Costas, J., & Kärreman, D. (2019). 'We are all herd animals': Community and
4
5 organizational in coworking spaces. *Organization*, 26, 894-916.
6
7
8 Bok, S. (1982) *Secrets: On the ethics of concealment and revelation*. New York, NY: Pantheon
9
10 Books.
11
12 Calvey, D. (2008). The art and politics of covert research: Doing 'situated ethics' in the field.
13
14 *Sociology*, 42, 905-918.
15
16
17 Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Thyssen, O. (2017). License to critique: A communication
18
19 perspective on sustainability standards. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 27, 239-262.
20
21
22 Cole, J. M., & Scrivener, H. (2013). Short term effects of gossip behavior on self-esteem.
23
24 *Current Psychology*, 32, 252-260.
25
26
27 Colson, E. (1953). *The Makah Indians: A study of an Indian tribe in modern American society*.
28
29 Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
30
31
32 Costas, J., & Grey, C. (2014). Bringing secrecy into the open: Towards a theorization of the
33
34 social processes of organizational secrecy. *Organization Studies*, 35, 1423-1447.
35
36
37 Costas, J., & Grey, C. (2016). *Secrecy at work: The hidden architecture of organizational life*.
38
39 Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
40
41
42 Crewe, E. (2015). *The house of commons: An anthropology of MPs at work*. London:
43
44 Bloomsbury.
45
46
47 Crothers, L. M., Lipinski, J., & Minutolo, M. C. (2009). Cliques, rumors, and gossip by the
48
49 water cooler: Female bullying in the workplace. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*,
50
51 12, 97-110.
52
53
54 Dalton, M. (1959). *Men who manage: Fusions of feeling and theory in administration*. New
55
56 York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
57
58
59 Diefenbach, T., & Sillince, J. A. (2011). Formal and informal hierarchy in different types of
60
organization. *Organization Studies*, 32, 1515-1537.

- 1
2
3 Dobusch, L., & Schoeneborn, D. (2015). Fluidity, identity, and organizationality: The
4 communicative constitution of Anonymous. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52, 1005-
5
6 1035.
7
8
9
10 Dunbar, R. I., Duncan, N. D., & Marriott, A. (1997). Human conversational behavior. *Human*
11
12 *Nature*, 8, 231-246.
13
14 Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational
15
16 communication. *Communication monographs*, 51, 227-242.
17
18 Emler, N. (1994). Gossip, reputation, and social adaptation. In: Goodman, R. F., & Ben-Ze'ev,
19
20 A., eds. *Good gossip* (pp. 117-138). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
21
22
23 Feldman, S. P. (1988). Secrecy, Information and Politics: An Essay in Organizational
24
25 Decisionmaking. *Human Relations*, 41, 73-90
26
27
28 Filstead, W. J. (ed.) (1970) *Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social*
29
30 *world*. Chicago, IL: Markham.
31
32
33 Foster, E. K. (2004). Research on gossip: Taxonomy, methods, and future directions. *Review*
34
35 *of General Psychology*, 8, 78-99.
36
37
38 Gabriel, Y. (1995). The unmanaged organization: Stories, fantasies and subjectivity.
39
40 *Organization Studies*, 16, 477-501.
41
42
43 Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
44
45
46 Grosser, T. J., Lopez-Kidwell, V., & Labianca, G. (2010). A social network analysis of positive
47
48 and negative gossip in organizational life. *Group & Organization Management*, 35,
49
50 177-212.
51
52
53 Guendouzi, J. (2001). 'You'll think we're always bitching': The functions of cooperativity and
54
55 competition in women's gossip. *Discourse Studies*, 3, 29-51.
56
57
58 Hafen, S. (2004). Organizational gossip: A revolving door of regulation and resistance.
59
60 *Southern Journal of Communication*, 69, 223-240.

- 1
2
3 Hallett, T., Harger, B., & Eder, D. (2009). Gossip at work: Unsanctioned evaluative talk in
4 formal school meetings. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 38, 584-618.
5
6
7
8 Hannerz, U. (1967). Gossip, networks and culture in a black American ghetto. *Ethnos*, 32, 35-
9
10 60.
11
12 Hardon, A., & Posel, D. (2012). Secrecy as embodied practice: Beyond the confessional
13 imperative. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 14, S1-S13.
14
15
16
17 Harrington, C. L., & Bielby, D. D. (1995). Where did you hear that? Technology and the social
18 organization of gossip. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36, 607-628.
19
20
21
22 Haviland, J. B. (1977). Gossip as competition in Zinacantan. *Journal of Communication*, 27,
23
24 186-191.
25
26
27 Horn, E. (2011). Logics of political secrecy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28, 103-122.
28
29 Jones, C. (2008). Editor's introduction [to a special essay section on secrecy]. *Journal of*
30
31 *Management Inquiry*, 17, 95-96.
32
33
34 Kniffin, K. M., & Wilson, D. S. (2005). Utilities of gossip across organizational levels. *Human*
35
36 *Nature*, 16, 278-292.
37
38
39 Kurland, N. B., & Pelled, L. H. (2000). Passing the word: Toward a model of gossip and power
40 in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 428-438.
41
42
43
44 Luhrmann, T. M. (1989). The magic of secrecy. *Ethos*, 17, 131-165.
45
46 Meyer Spacks, P. (1985). *Gossip*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
47
48
49 Michelson, G., van Iterson, A., & Waddington, K. (2010). Gossip in organizations: Contexts,
50 consequences, and controversies. *Group & Organization Management*, 35, 371-390.
51
52
53 Mills, C. (2010). Experiencing gossip: The foundations for a theory of embedded
54 organizational gossip. *Group & Organization Management*, 35, 213-240.
55
56
57 Noon, M., & Delbridge, R. (1993). News from behind my hand: Gossip in organizations.
58
59 *Organization Studies*, 14, 23-36.
60

- 1
2
3 Paine, R. (1967). What is gossip about? An alternative hypothesis. *Man*, 2, 278-285.
4
5
6 Parker, M. (2000). *Organizational culture and identity*. London: Sage.
7
8 Parker, M. (2016). Secret societies: Intimations of organization. *Organization Studies*, 37, 99-
9
10 113.
11
12 Parker, M. (2017). Tower cranes and Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, 38, 989-
13
14 1004.
15
16
17 Rosnow, R. L. (1977). Gossip and marketplace psychology. *Journal of Communication*, 27,
18
19 158-163.
20
21
22 Rosnow, R. L., & Foster, E. K. (2005). Rumor and gossip research. *Psychological Science*
23
24 *Agenda*, 19, 1-4.
25
26
27 Roulet, T. J., Gill, M. J., Stenger, S., & Gill, D. J. (2017). Reconsidering the value of covert
28
29 research: The role of ambiguous consent in participant observation. *Organizational*
30
31 *Research Methods*, 20, 487-517.
32
33
34 Roy, D. F. (1959). "Banana Time": Job satisfaction and informal interaction. *Human*
35
36 *Organization*, 18, 158-168.
37
38
39 Schein, E. H. (1985/2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*, 4th ed. San Francisco, CA:
40
41 Jossey-Bass.
42
43
44 Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn, T. R., & Kärreman, D. (2019). The communicative constitution of
45
46 organization, organizing, and organizationality. *Organization Studies*, 40, 475-496.
47
48
49 Scott, C. R. (2015). Bringing hidden organizations out of the shadows: Introduction to the
50
51 special issue. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 29, 503-511.
52
53
54 Simmel, G. (1906/1950). *The sociology of Georg Simmel*, translated and edited by Wolff, K.
55
56 H. New York, NY: Free Press.
57
58
59 Stewart, P. J., & Strathern, A. (2004). *Witchcraft, sorcery, rumors and gossip*. Cambridge:
60
Cambridge University Press.

- 1
2
3 Suls, J. M. (1977). Gossip as social comparison. *Journal of Communication*, 27, 164-168.
4
5 Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2000). *The emergent organization: Communication as its*
6
7 *site and surface*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8
9
10 Thornborrow, J., & Morris, D. (2004). Gossip as strategy: The management of talk about others
11
12 on reality TV show 'Big Brother'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8, 246-271.
13
14 van Iterson, A., Waddington, K., & Michelson, G. (2011). Breaking the silence: The role of
15
16 gossip in organizational culture. In: Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson,
17
18 M. F., eds. *Handbook of organizational culture and climate 2nd ed* (pp. 375-392).
19
20 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
21
22
23 Van Maanen, J. (2011). Ethnography as work: Some rules of engagement. *Journal of*
24
25 *Management Studies*, 48, 218-234.
26
27
28 Waddington, K. (2005). Using diaries to explore the characteristics of work-related gossip:
29
30 Methodological considerations from exploratory multimethod research. *Journal of*
31
32 *Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 221-236.
33
34
35 Waddington, K. (2012). *Gossip and organizations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
36
37
38 Waddington, K. (2016). Rethinking gossip and scandal in healthcare organizations. *Journal of*
39
40 *Health Organization and Management*, 30, 810-817.
41
42
43 Wert, S. R., & Salovey, P. (2004). A social comparison account of gossip. *Review of General*
44
45 *Psychology*, 8, 122-137.
46
47
48 Winkler, P., Etter, M., & Castello, I. (2020). Vicious and virtuous circles of aspirational talk:
49
50 From self-persuasive to agonistic CSR rhetoric. *Business and Society*, 59, 98-128.
51
52

Author biographies

53
54 **Ziyun Fan** is a lecturer in Organization Studies at Northumbria University, Newcastle. She
55
56 holds a PhD in Organization Studies from Royal Holloway, University of London. Her work
57
58 primarily focuses on critical management studies, organizational communication, gossip, and
59
60 secrecy.

1
2
3
4
5 **Christopher Grey** FAcSS is Professor of Organization Studies at Royal Holloway, University
6 of London. He previously held chairs at Cambridge and at Warwick. He has published widely
7 and diversely in organization studies and is the author of *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and*
8 *Reasonably Cheap Book about Studying Organizations* (Sage, 4th Edition, 2017) and *Decoding*
9 *Organization: Bletchley Park, Codebreaking and Organization Studies* (Cambridge University
10 Press, 2012), and co-author of *Secrecy at Work. The Hidden Architecture of Organizational*
11 *Life* (Stanford University Press, 2016).
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Dan Kärreman** is Professor in Management and Organization Studies at Copenhagen
19 Business School, Denmark and Professor in Management at Royal Holloway, University of
20 London, UK. He is also affiliated to the LUMOS group at Lund University, Sweden. His
21 research interests include critical management studies, knowledge work, organization
22 communication, identity in organizations, leadership, organizational control and research
23 methodology.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60